

In the Drawing

Applicants submit herewith replacement FIGURES 1 and 2 for the Examiner's approval. FIGURES 1 and 2 have been redrawn as formal drawing replacement sheets. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

As a result of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-18 stand rejected. Claims 1-10, 12, and 17 have been canceled. Claims 11 and 13-14 have been amended. Claims 15-16, and 18 continue unamended. Claims 11, 13-16, and 18 are presented for reconsideration.

Objection to the Drawing

The informal drawing FIGURES 1 and 2 were objected to by the Examiner. In response, formal drawing has been prepared and REPLACEMENT SHEETS are attached.

In a telephone conversation with the Examiner, it was pointed out that in the body of the Office Action, a two month limit was set in which to respond to the drawing objection, but a three month time limit was listed on the front cover sheet of the Office Action. Due to this discrepancy, the Examiner told the undersigned attorney that he would accept the drawing replacement sheets at the same time as the response to the Office Action, and that the application is not abandoned. Applicant's undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for this decision.

No new matter has been added.

In view of the submission of the replacement sheets, Applicants submit that the grounds for the objection have been overcome, and respectfully request that the objection to the drawing be withdrawn.

Objection to the Abstract Under MPEP § 608.01(b):

The Abstract stand objected to under MPEP § 608.01(b) for failing to be in the range of 50 to 150 words in length. The Abstract has been amended to conform to the requirement of MPEP § 608.01(b). No new matter has been added.

In view of the amendment to the Abstract, Applicants submit that the grounds for the objection have been overcome and respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-18 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gauland, et al. ('185). Claims 1-10, 12, and 17 have been canceled. Claims 11 and 13-14 have been amended. Claims 15-16, and 18 continue unamended. Claims 11, 13-16, and 18 are presented for reconsideration.

Specifically, it was said in the outstanding Office Action that with respect to claims 1-6, Gauland, et al. ('185) (hereinafter "Gauland") shows a system for determining the number of triggering events during a predetermined interval to establish a rate of trigger event occurrences. However, column 2, lines 49-52, of Gauland describe the system of US patent 4,716,345 (Shank, et al.), which merely states that two trigger circuits are used to allow triggering at the same level on both edges of a pulse signal to determine the duty cycle of the signal.

Oscilloscopes have traditionally gathered Autoset information by operating on the received signal in software in a post-acquisition mode. That is, the software examined the number of trigger edges that occurred in a single acquisition in order to determine the pulse width of the signal, and thereby set the horizontal timebase of the oscilloscope the the correct value to display one or two cycles of the signal on screen. This process tends to be somewhat slow. The subject application solves this problem; neither Gauland nor Shank addresses it.

It is important to note, as the Examiner points out, that Gauland cites a patent that does address this problem, US 5,155,431 (Holcomb). FIGURE 1 of Holcomb '431 shows a trigger counter 26 which receives an output signal from a level-sensing circuit (Schmidt trigger 24). In this way, edge finding is done on-the-fly in hardware, a considerable time saving.

However, Holcomb '431 provides teaching with respect to hardware-enabled edge triggering only. That is, Holcomb '431 does not teach, show, or suggest,

"an advanced trigger module, for generating a plurality of trigger condition indicative signals in response to trigger events occurring in at least one input signal;
a multiplexer, for receiving from said advanced trigger module each of a said plurality of trigger condition indicative signals and selecting therefrom one of said trigger condition indicative signals for further processing; and
an event counter module, for counting the number of said said selected trigger condition indicative signals occurring during a predefined time period to establish thereby a rate of occurrence of said selected trigger condition indicative signals",

as called for in amended claim 11.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants submit that Gauland '185, Shrank '345, and Holcomb '431, either singly or in combination, cannot, and do not, anticipate claims 11, 13-16, and 18 of the subject application, and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11, 13-16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.


Additional Fees: No fee other than the extension fee is believed due. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge that fee to Deposit Account 20-0352.

Conclusion:

In view of all of the above, Applicants submit that the subject application is in a condition for allowance, and respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Delacy, et al.

By: 

Thomas F. Lenihan
Reg. No. 32,152
(503) 627-7266 (Voice)
(503) 627-7119 (Fax)

06 December 2005
Tektronix, Inc.
P.O. Box 500
Delivery Station 50-LAW
Beaverton, OR 97077